

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action of July 13, 2005 as well as to the telephonic interview with Examiner Aggarwal on October 5th 2005 in which the following objections were raised: Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,543,954).

Applicant has amended Independent Claims 1, 4 and 6.

EXAMINER TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW October 5, 2005

Applicant appreciates the telephonic interview with Examiner Yogesh K. Aggarwal on October 5th 2005. The Applicant conceded that the Nicholson reference did teach two moveable mirrors providing input to the objective of a camera. The Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that the optical path to the camera in the Nicholson reference was at all times composed of two right angle bends provided by each of the Nicholson mirrors and that at no time was there tilting of the optical input path or a tilting of either mirror. The Applicant pointed out that the angle of incidence of the optical input path with the Nicholson mirror 12 shown in Figure 3 thereof was constant during rotation of the mirror 12 about the 'Y' axis shown in Figure 3 thereof. The Applicant further pointed out to the Examiner the limited field of view swept out by the Nicholson mirrors as a result of the mirror configuration corresponded with a cylindrical strip around the 'Y' axis of the Nicholson camera shown in Figure 3, thereof.

The Applicant then directed the Examiner's attention to the Applicant's FIGS. 2-4 in which the details of the Applicant's panning and tilting mirror linkages are shown. The Applicant then contrasted the Applicant's panning and tilting mechanism in which the tilting mirror tilts the optical input path to the camera through a broad angular range and the angle of incidence of the optical input path and the tilting mirror varies during tilting. The Applicant pointed out that the hemispherical field of view swept out by the Applicant's panning and tilting mirrors differed markedly from the significantly more limited cylindrical strip field of view provided by the Nicholson mirrors. The Applicant then presented the proposed amendment to Claim 1 as found in this response for the Examiner's consideration.

The Examiner indicated he understood the proposed amendment in light of those figures and the Claim and appeared receptive upon filing of an RCE to considering a withdrawal of the Nicholson reference.

The Applicant then discussed dependent Claim 2 with the Examiner. The Applicant and Examiner discussed in detail the belt 30 shown in Nicholson's Figures 1-3 which belt drives both mirrors 14 and 12 directly without any intervening drive member, planetary or otherwise. The Applicant pointed out that the relative motion of mirrors 12, 14 resulted from the application of a drive ring brake 84 which arrested the rotation of mirror 14 with resultant slippage of the belt.

The Applicant contrasted the Applicant's planetary linkage to the Nicholson belt drive. The Applicant pointed out that in the linkage in the Applicant's claimed invention was a true planetary linkage in which relative rotation of the guide and mirror wheels produces rotation of the planetary member which in turn tilts the tilt mirror. The Examiner appeared receptive upon the filing of an RCE to considering a withdrawal of the Nicholson reference as to Claim 2.

CLAIMS 1-7 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,543,954). The Examiner has cited the Nicholson reference as disclosing a panning mirror and a tilting mirror coupled to the objective of a camera. The Applicant respectfully rejects that characterization.

The Applicant incorporates by reference the above summary of the Examiner's interview. The Nicholson reference discloses a pair of mirrors rotationally coupled for rotation about 'X' and 'Y' axis. Neither mirror tilts with respect to the other, or with respect to the axis about which it rotates (See Nicholson Figures 1-3 and accompanying text.)

The Applicant's amended Claim 1 includes the limitation of a tilting mirror which tilts toward and away from the panning mirror during concentric rotation therewith about the objective of the camera. This limitation is not disclosed in the Nicholson reference and

therefore is not anticipated by same. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Nicholson reference as to amended Independent Claim 1 and as to amended Independent Claims 4 and 6 which also include the tilting mirror limitation. Remaining Claims 2-3, 5, and 7 dependent from corresponding ones of Independent Claims 1, 4 and 6 are also not anticipated by the Nicholson reference for the reasons discussed above and for other reasons of independent significance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, and the amendments to the Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining Claims 1-7 have been placed in a condition for allowance, and requests that they be allowed. Early notice to this effect is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1338 (Docket No. STGUP008).

Respectfully submitted,

IP CREATORS



Charles C. Cary
Registration No. 36,764

Date: November 15, 2005

P.O. Box 2789
Cupertino, CA 95015
Tel: (408) 850-9585
Fax: (408) 850-9585
E-mail: cccary@ipcreators.com